

Higher Education's Third Revolution: The Emergence of the Democratic Cosmopolitan Civic University

Lee Benson
University of Pennsylvania

Ira Harkavy
University of Pennsylvania

Abstract

In this article, the authors argue that American higher education is in the early stages of a third revolution that is leading to the emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university. To help accelerate its development, the authors propose that each higher educational institution make its highest priority the radical integration and improvement of the overall schooling system in its "home" (local ecological) community. They recognize the difficulty of putting this strategy into practice, but Benson and Harkavy emphasize that a similar strategy to advance university and community development had been employed at the turn of the 20th century by William Rainey Harper and John Dewey at the University of Chicago. The authors highlight three of the many university-school partnerships (including one engaging their own institution, the University of Pennsylvania) that illustrate an accelerating university civic responsibility movement. The authors conclude by calling on American research universities to take the lead in revolutionizing the overall American schooling system and thereby realize in practice the Harper-Dewey prophetic vision and strategy.

Following Donald Kennedy's provocative lead in a recent book, *Academic Duty*, we view American higher education as being in the early stages of its third revolution (Kennedy, 1997). The first revolution, of course, occurred in the late 19th century. Beginning at Johns Hopkins in 1876, the accelerating adoption and uniquely American adaptation of the German model revolutionized American higher education. By the turn of the century, the American research university essentially had been created. The second revolution began in 1945 with Vannevar Bush's "endless [research] frontier" manifesto and rapidly produced the Big Science, Cold War, Entrepreneurial University (Stokes, 1997). The third revolution, we believe, began in 1989. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold

War provided the necessary conditions for the “revolutionary” emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university, a new type of university engaged in the advancement of democratic schooling and practical realization of the democratic promise of America for all Americans.¹

How can the emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university be credibly explained? Largely (though over-simply), as a defensive response to the increasingly obvious, increasingly embarrassing, increasingly immoral contradiction between the increasing status, wealth, and power of American higher education (particularly its elite research university component) and the increasingly pathological state of American cities.

To paraphrase Oliver Goldsmith’s late 18th-century lament for *The Deserted Village*, while American research universities flourished in the late 20th century as never before, “ill fared the American city, to hastening ills a prey.” If American research universities were really so great, why were American cities so pathological? After the Cold War ended, the contradiction became increasingly obvious, troubling, indefensible, and immoral.

Put another way, the manifest contradiction between the power and the performance of American higher education sparked the emergence of the democratic cosmopolitan civic university. Accelerating external and internal pressures forced research universities to recognize very reluctantly that they must (and could) function as institutions simultaneously engaged in the advancement of universal knowledge and the improvement of local well-being. Put still another way, after 1989 the combination of external pressure and enlightened self-interest spurred American research universities to recognize that they could, indeed must, function simultaneously as universal and as local institutions of higher education—cosmopolitan civic institutions not only *in* but *of* their local communities.

To reduce or avoid misunderstanding, we must emphasize that we view the “third revolution” as still in its early stages. As the old academic joke has it, universities tend to move with all the speed of a runaway glacier. But things are changing in the right direction. One indicator of positive change is the accelerating number and variety of “higher-eds” (a less cumbersome term than “higher-educational institutions”) that now publicly proclaim their desire to collaborate actively with their neighboring public schools and local communities. Predictably, public proclamations of collaboration to date far surpass tangible, interactive, mutually respectful and beneficial collaboration. Nevertheless, progress is being made.

To help accelerate progress to the point where major changes become firmly institutionalized and produce significant results, we call for acceptance of this radical proposition: *All higher-eds should explicitly make solving the problem of the American schooling system their highest institutional priority; their contribution to its solution should count heavily in assessing their institutional performance.* Actively helping to develop an effective, integrated, optimally democratic, pre-K through higher-ed schooling system, we contend, should become the collaborative primary mission of American universities and colleges.

Primary mission doesn’t mean sole mission. Obviously, American higher-eds now have important missions other than collaboratively helping to solve the problem of the American schooling system. If space permitted, we would try to show in detail how those other missions would benefit greatly from successful collaborative work on the schooling problem. Here we restrict ourselves to a bare-bones statement of three corollary propositions:

- Given the radically disruptive, complex consequences (for example, political, economic) of the extraordinarily rapid development of information societies throughout

the world, solving the schooling system problem should now constitute American society's highest priority.

- Solving the overall problem of the schooling system must begin with changes at the higher-ed level.
- Solving the overall schooling system problem would, in the long run, directly and indirectly give higher-eds much greater resources than they now have to carry out all their important missions.

In the short run, we concede, our proposed mission change would require higher-eds to experience the trauma entailed by any attempt to change academic priorities and cultures radically. In effect, we are calling on higher-eds to reallocate the largest share of their intellectual (and other) resources to the immediate improvement of their neighboring public schools and communities. Given their present ferociously competitive, "pure research" orientation, how in the world can we possibly expect higher-eds to answer our call positively rather than derisively, dismissively, or contemptuously? Is our proposal to change academic priorities so lacking in good sense, so revolutionary, that readers will angrily reject it as irresponsible, self-defeating, delusionary utopianism? Are we nuts?

We can pose the question less colloquially and more academically: Why should self-congratulatory, increasingly rich, prestigious, powerful, and "successful" American universities undertake the terribly hard job of trying to transform themselves into civic institutions that actively and wholeheartedly accept collaboration with their local schools and communities as their categorical imperative for the new millennium? They should try to do that, we contend, for good institutional reasons: If they succeed, they will be much better able than they are now to achieve their self-professed, loudly trumpeted missions; namely, to advance, preserve, and transmit knowledge, as well as help produce the well-educated, cultured, truly moral citizens necessary to develop and maintain an optimally democratic society (Anderson, 1993; Harkavy, 1999).

We think it axiomatic that universities (particularly elite research universities with highly selective arts and sciences colleges) function as the primary shapers of the overall American schooling system. We think it equally axiomatic that the schooling system increasingly functions as the core subsystem (the strategic subsystem) of modern information societies. More than any other subsystem, it now influences the functioning of the societal system as a whole. Viewed systematically, on balance, it has the greatest "multiplier" effects—direct and indirect, short and long term. Its highly integrated effective functioning, therefore, should logically have the highest societal priority.

To understate the case extravagantly, to fully develop the democratic cosmopolitan civic university dedicated to, actively engaged in, and pragmatically capable of solving the problem of the American schooling system will be extraordinarily hard. There is a great deal to think about, figure out, and do. To fully develop this new type of American university will require countering the dominant Big Science, Cold War University strategy with a more compelling, inspiring, and intelligent strategy. Fortunately, we do not have to invent an entirely new counterstrategy. Instead, we can (partially) go back to the future.

At the turn of the 20th century, William Rainey Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago, and John Dewey, that university's most prominent scholar, eloquently and passionately placed schooling and education at the center of the American Progressive intellectual and institution-building agendas. We can follow their lead, stand on their shoulders, and work to realize their vision.

The Harper-Dewey Vision: Schooling and Pedagogy as the Endless American Frontier

In 1904 Dewey quarreled with Harper and left Chicago for Columbia. His angry departure subsequently tended to mask the striking similarities in their overall vision and educational ideas. To quote intellectual historian George Marsden's (1994) highly insightful observation:

At the University of Chicago Dewey was the head both of the Department of Philosophy and of the new Department of Pedagogy (later Education) in which he established his experimental school, where he tested his progressive theories of education. *Both in developing what became his instrumentalist philosophy and in his accompanying action-oriented educational theory, Dewey proved himself a kindred spirit to Harper. Dewey and Harper both believed in the redemptive functions of education. Dewey viewed the public schools as virtually the new established church, teaching the values of American democracy [emphasis added].* Though Dewey had worked out the theory further than Harper, each believed that science was the key to finding unifying communitarian values, because only through science could one eliminate superstitions and sectarian differences and thus build an inclusivist "community of truth." Dewey's talk, presented to the students at Michigan, "Christianity and Democracy," and Harper's "Democracy and the University," despite some obvious differences, were two of a kind. (pp. 250–251.)

Even more than Dewey, Harper made a critically important intellectual contribution when he identified the university as the strategic institution capable of creating a genuinely democratic society. For Harper, the American university had a singular purpose: its "holy" purpose was to be the "prophet of democracy." Indeed, no other "captain of erudition" (that remarkable set of religiously inspired, turn-of-the-century university presidents who, contrary to the myopic village cynic, Thorstein Veblen, transformed the American university into a major national progressive institution) so passionately and so farsightedly envisioned the university's democratic potential and purpose.² Profoundly religious, deeply dedicated to the progressive Social Gospel, Harper conceptualized the university as the holy place designed to fulfill democracy's creed: "the brotherhood, and consequently the equality of man." The university would fulfill that creed through "Service for mankind, wherever mankind is, whether within scholastic walls, or without these walls and in the world at large." (Harper, 1905, pp. 21, 28–29.)

"Service for mankind" meant working for the democratization of mankind. To help achieve that egalitarian goal, Harper envisioned the University of Chicago functioning as a societally engaged "Great University." By 1905, its astonishing success probably helped reinforce his conviction that

there is a trend in higher-education... it is clear that everything points in one direction, namely, toward the growing democratization of higher-education work... It would almost seem at the first glance that a complete revolution had taken place; but a closer study of the facts convinces one that here as everywhere change has come step by step, and that it will go on step by step. Moreover one cannot imagine that a time will ever come when these forward steps will cease to be taken. Changes are taking place today which could not have been dreamed of fifty years ago... (pp. 19–20.)

Several years earlier, in his 1899 essay "The University and Democracy," Harper presented his radically anti-elitist, uniquely American idea of the university in powerful, moving language:

The university, I contend, is this prophet of democracy, the agency established by heaven itself to proclaim the principles of democracy [emphasis added]. It is in the university that the best opportunity is afforded to investigate the movements of the past and to present the facts and principles involved before the public. It is the university that, as the center of thought, is to maintain for democracy the unity so essential for its success. The university is the prophetic school out of which come the teachers who are to lead democracy in the true path [emphasis added]. It is the university that must guide democracy into the new fields of arts and literature and science. It is the university that fights the battles of democracy, its war-cry being: "Come, let us reason together." It is the university that, in these latter days, goes forth with buoyant spirit to comfort and give help to those who are downcast, taking up its dwelling in the very midst of squalor and distress [emphasis added]. It is the university that, with impartial judgment, condemns in democracy the spirit of corruption which now and again lifts up its head, and brings scandal upon democracy's fair name...

The university, I maintain, is the prophetic interpreter of democracy; the prophet of her past, in all its vicissitudes; the prophet of her present, in all its complexity; the prophet of her future, in all its possibilities [emphasis added]. (Harper, 1905, pp. 19–20.)

For Harper, the new urban university in particular would be the strategic agent or agency to help America realize and fulfill its democratic promise. Other university presidents, such as Daniel Coit Gilman of Johns Hopkins and Seth Low of Columbia, enthusiastically seized the opportunity to build their institutions by working to improve the quality of life in American cities experiencing the traumatic effects of industrialization, immigration, large-scale urbanization, and the unprecedented emergence of an international economy.³ But Harper saw much further and went much further than his presidential colleagues when he predicted that an institutional transformation (a positive mutation) would result if universities engaged in planned interactions with their urban environments. In 1902, speaking at Nicholas Murray Butler's inauguration as president of Columbia University, Harper prophetically hailed the extraordinary intellectual and institutional advances that would come about when that occurred:

A university which will adapt itself to urban influence, which will undertake to serve as an expression of urban civilization, and which is compelled to meet the demands of an urban environment, will in the end become something essentially different from a university located in a village or small city [emphasis added]. Such an institution will in time differentiate itself from other institutions. It will gradually take on new characteristics both outward and inward, and it will ultimately form a new type of university [emphasis added]. (Harper, 1905, p. 158.)

In that same address, Harper in effect invoked Dewey's fundamentally pragmatic proposition that major advances in knowledge tend to occur when human beings consciously work to solve the central problems confronting their society. "The urban universities found today in... [the] largest cities in this country... and in [Europe]..." Harper declaimed, "form a class by themselves, in as much as they are compelled to deal with problems which are not involved in the work of universities located in smaller cities... Just as the great cities of the country represent the national life in its fullness and variety, so the urban universities are in the truest sense... national universities." To conclude his address, he proclaimed that of all the great institutions in New York City, Columbia University was "the greatest." In Chicago, Harper certainly believed his university held that preeminent position (Harper, 1905, pp. 158–160).

Inexplicably to us, throughout his long career, Dewey gave little attention to the powerful role that universities could actively play in fulfilling America's democratic promise. He and Harper strongly agreed, however, that higher education's primary focus should be on schooling, education, and pedagogy. Given their basic conviction that democratic schools constituted the essential institutions for a democratic society, it is not surprising that schooling took central stage for them. According to Dewey, universities should see "education... not merely as a *fitting topic for serious and prolonged study, but the most important of subjects for such study*" [emphasis added]. Like Harper, Dewey emphasized the great intellectual benefits that would accrue to the university if it focused on education and schooling. Rich and complex, the problem of improving education involved study of "civic... state [and federal] administration," "sociology of the child," history, psychology, philosophy, and "problems [that] are political as well as economic." For its own sake and for society's sake, therefore, "the scientific study of education," according to Dewey, "should represent the finest self-consciousness of the university of its own work and destiny—of its mission for itself and for society of which it is both minister and organ." (Dewey, 1907/1976, pp. 158–164.)

Unfortunately, after leaving Chicago for Columbia, Dewey did little to directly or practically connect universities to primary and secondary schools. For example, he failed to take advantage of the extraordinary resources that Teachers College could potentially mobilize to help shape New York City schools and advance education as a discipline in concrete practice rather than in abstract theory. Until his untimely death in 1906, Harper, unlike Dewey, practically involved himself with public education. While president of the University of Chicago and terribly overcommitted in the heroic efforts that resulted in his premature death, he actively served on the Chicago Board of Education. Before Dewey arrived at Chicago in 1894, Harper had advocated and worked hard to construct an integrated educational system from preschool through the university. (Dewey learned much from Harper.) In Harper's grand vision, the University of Chicago functioned as the active central hub of a highly integrated network of schools, academies, and colleges (University of Chicago, 1992, pp. ix–x). For him, "the sympathies of the true university will be so broad as to bring it into touch with educational problems of every kind." (Harper, 1905, pp. 6–7.)

To realize in practice the promise of American democracy, Harper worked tirelessly to develop pedagogy as a university discipline of distinction and to make teaching *at all levels* a profession "equal" to any other. In 1896, the year Dewey began the Laboratory School, Harper enthusiastically proclaimed his "desire to do for the Department of Pedagogy *what has not been undertaken in any other institution*" [emphasis added]. Even more emphatically, Harper declared to a university trustee who implied that it was below the university's dignity to sponsor a journal focused on precollegiate schools: "As a university we are interested *above all else* in pedagogy" [emphasis added]. (Wirth, 1964, pp. 47–48.) Harper's devotion to pedagogy logically derived from two propositions central to his vision for the University of Chicago in particular and for American universities in general:

- "Education is the basis of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy." (Harper, 1905, p. 32.)
- *More than any other institution*, the university determines the character of the schooling system. To quote him: "Through the school system, the character of which, in spite of itself, the university determines and in a larger measure controls ... through the school system every family in this entire broad land of ours is brought into touch with the university; for from it proceeds the teachers or the teachers' teachers." (Harper, 1905, p. 25.)

In our judgment, the Harper-Dewey “university-school partnership platform” is, to mix metaphors shamelessly, the appropriate launching pad to create the new American democratic cosmopolitan civic university. *The task confronting American academics, we contend, is to realize in the 21st century the unrealized Harper-Dewey vision.* For many reasons, among them the central place education now occupies in public concern and debate, the conditions are now much more favorable than ever before to create the schooling/education/pedagogy-centered university Harper and Dewey envisioned. Moreover, a variety of nationally significant, on-the-ground, university-school partnerships—including one that engages our own institution, the University of Pennsylvania—now provide the local bases to develop the new type of university prophetically foreseen by Harper, in which schooling and pedagogy function as the endless frontier for institutional and societal improvement.

Three Higher-Ed Public School Partnerships as Empirical Indicators of a National “University Civic Responsibility Movement”

Since 1985 Penn has increasingly engaged itself with its local public schools in a comprehensive school-community-university partnership, the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC). In its 15 years of operation, the project, has, of course, evolved significantly. From its inception, however, we conceptualized Penn’s work with WEPIC as designed to forge *mutually beneficial and respectful* university-school-community partnerships. WEPIC has helped spawn a variety of related projects that also engage Penn with public schools in its local community of West Philadelphia. Among these projects are two new, highly ambitious ventures:

- Leading a coalition of higher-eds, medical and other nonprofit institutions, for-profit firms, and community groups to improve 25 West Philadelphia public schools.
- Developing a university-assisted public school adjacent to campus in partnership with the School District of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers.

Reaching this level of activity has been neither an easy nor a straight path. Moreover, Penn is only now beginning to tap its extraordinary resources in ways that eventually will mutually benefit Penn and its neighbors and result in substantial school, community, and university change. Significantly, we have come to see our work as a concrete example of a general theory of action-oriented, real-world, problemsolving learning. Our real-world strategic problem, we have come to see, has been and continues to be radically improving the quality of the entire West Philadelphia schooling system, beginning with Penn. A central component of Penn’s work with the West Philadelphia public schools has been the development of approximately 100 academically based community service courses that involve faculty members and graduate and undergraduate students in projects largely designed to improve pre-K through higher-ed schooling in West Philadelphia.

It cannot be overemphasized that the accelerating changes in Penn’s relationship to its local schools are not atypical, not unique to Penn. More or less similar changes throughout the country testify to the growth of something like a “University Civic Responsibility Movement”—a national movement designed to construct a genuinely democratic schooling system and advance American democracy. To illustrate the point, we turn to three examples of significant higher education-public school partnerships.

Since we know it best, we begin with an example derived from our national efforts to create university-assisted community schools in which public schools, with significant

help from their local higher-eds, function as centers for community building, community learning, and community improvement. Late in 1992, the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund awarded Penn a planning grant to study the feasibility of other universities and colleges replicating its work with local schools. The planning grant achieved its purpose. By 1994 more than 50 institutions expressed interest in the project and 17 submitted requests for funds to replicate the Penn model, as appropriately adapted to their particular institution and geographic community. Convinced of the project's feasibility, in November 1994 the Fund awarded the Center for Community Partnerships a 3-year, \$1 million grant to replicate its university-assisted community school model at three universities: University of Kentucky-Lexington (UK), University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB), and Miami University of Ohio (working in Cincinnati). The grant also was to be used to strengthen development of a national network of academic and public school personnel interested in university-school partnerships.

The project succeeded so well that it received renewed funding from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, and additional support from the Corporation for National Service-Learn and Serve America. In spring 1998 two of the three initial sites (UK and UAB) were selected to receive continued funding, and seven colleges and universities were selected as new sites for adoption and adaptation of the WEPIC approach: Bates College, Clark Atlanta University, Community College of Aurora, University of Dayton, University of Denver, University of New Mexico at Albuquerque, and University of Rhode Island. It is still early, but initial returns from this highly diverse group of institutions (a small college, a historically black university, a community college, a Catholic university, a metropolitan university, and two land-grant institutions) are highly encouraging. Moreover, we continue to learn from the creative approaches to university-assisted community schools being developed by our colleagues at UK and UAB. Additional support has recently been provided by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to work with eight universities and their school and community partners each year to develop university-assisted community schools.

Numerous other significant higher education-school partnerships developed during the 1990s could be cited. Restricted by space considerations, we can only briefly describe Clark Atlanta University's partnership with University Park Campus School and the University of Texas at El Paso's work with the El Paso Collaborative. We chose them for inclusion here because they closely resemble Penn's two most recent initiatives—construction and development of a pre-K–8 university-assisted public school and leadership of a coalition of institutions and community organizations working with West Philadelphia public schools. We trust our choice of examples, which resonate with what we know best—namely our own university—will not be perceived as self-centered and self-aggrandizing. On-the-ground knowledge of similar projects at Penn, we assume, helps us to better understand and delineate complex partnerships involving different kinds of higher-eds in very different localities.

In 1997 Clark Atlanta University and the Worcester Public School system began collaborating on efforts to develop an exemplary grade 7–12 neighborhood school, the University Park Campus School (UPCS), designed to function as the centerpiece of Clark's comprehensive effort to renew its deteriorating local community. Proceeding with "all deliberate speed," UPCS opened with a seventh-grade class. Each year a new class will be added until the full complement of about 200 secondary school students is reached.

Conceptualized by Clark's President Richard Traina as a grade 7–16+ learning community, UPCS is closely integrated with the university. Students who graduate from UPCS

will be eligible for full tuition scholarships to Clark. Moreover, Clark faculty and approximately 100 students work at the school, teaching, tutoring, and volunteering. During the spring 1999 semester, Clark courses in sociology, Shakespeare, physics, and writing, as well as a Geographic Information System (GIS) project, were linked to the public school to provide active learning opportunities for both UPCS and Clark students. Not surprisingly, Clark's partnership with UPCS has received significant national attention, including praise from President Clinton and U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley.⁴

Another program that has gained significant national attention is the El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence. The Collaborative is a coalition of university, school district officials, local business leaders, community organizations, and three local business leaders, community organizations, and three local school districts—El Paso, Ysleta, and Sorocco—with a combined student enrollment of 135,000. It is one of six similar partnerships supported by the Pew Charitable Trusts “to bolster community-wide cooperation to improve educational opportunity, especially for minority students.” (Sommerfeld, 1994.)

Led by the president of the University of Texas at El Paso, Diana Natalicio, the Collaborative functions as an impressively broad-gauged effort to improve teaching and learning from elementary school through college. The university, El Paso Community College, and the public schools have worked together to align college admission standards with high school graduation requirements as well as improve teacher training. Demonstrating the practical benefits of collaboration, student teachers enrolled in the University of Texas at El Paso now spend significantly more time in public school classrooms than they did before the Collaborative began. The university's College of Education has also involved arts and sciences faculty members in educating candidates for teaching degrees in academic subjects. The program's success includes a decrease in the number of low-performing schools in the Collaborative's three districts from 15 to zero, and an increase in the number of El Paso schools recognized as exemplary by the Texas Education Agency from 2 in 1992–93 to 76 in 1997–98.⁵ As a result, the Collaborative has attracted attention from higher educational leaders in other States. We think it highly significant that Donald N. Langenberg, chancellor of the University System of Maryland, has emphasized this key lesson from the El Paso experience: Successful reform requires collaboratively connecting the overall schooling system from elementary to higher education:

We have come to believe strongly, and elementary and secondary schools have come to believe, that they cannot reform without us...

This is not telling them how to do it, but both of us working together to fix what's wrong with our education systems [emphasis added]... We prepare teachers for the public schools, and we admit their students. So it's our problem just as much as theirs [emphasis added]. (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1998, p. A20.)

Summing Up

Chancellor Langenberg's statement neatly returns us to the central component of the Dewey-Harper vision: To educate young people so that they function as active, informed, intelligent, and moral citizens in a fully democratic society requires a highly interactive, effectively integrated, and genuinely democratic schooling system from preschool through the university and beyond. Alas, American society is a long way from realizing the radically improved schooling system that Harper and Dewey envisioned and worked to achieve. Times *are* changing, however; signs of progress *can* be found across the educational landscape. Among other reasons for the change, we suggest, the emerging

revolution in American higher education and society is transforming the big science, Cold War university into the democratic cosmopolitan civic university—a uniquely American university dedicated to the construction of an optimally democratic schooling system and the development of an optimally democratic society.

To succeed, revolutions require agents determined enough, wise enough, and powerful enough to implement radical plans for action. Inspired by Harper and numerous others, we have proposed that American universities play that role. Our “revolutionary” proposal is quintessentially American. It calls on research universities to take a lead in revolutionizing the overall American schooling system. More specifically, our proposed “Schooling Revolution, American Style” calls on each higher-ed to make its highest priority the radical integration and improvement of the overall schooling system in its “home community.” In other words, the community in which it is located and the schooling system and community ecological system that it can most directly, most powerfully, affect, and that directly, powerfully, now affects its own “health” and functioning.

Summarily stated, in our judgment, it is time (long past time) to realize in practice the Harper-Dewey vision of the uniquely American schooling/education/pedagogy-centered university and thereby fulfill the democratic promise of American higher education in particular and American schooling and society in general.

Authors

Lee Benson is professor emeritus of history and a distinguished fellow of the Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania. He collaborates with Ira Harkavy on action-oriented research and teaching designed to exemplify their conviction that the primary mission of the American universities is to help realize an optimally democratic society and world. Benson is co-executive editor of Universities and Community Schools and is the author of six books.

Ira Harkavy is associate vice president and director of the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania. He teaches in the departments of history, urban studies, and city and regional planning. He is co-executive editor of Universities and Community Schools and is an editorial board member of Non-Profit Voluntary Sector Quarterly and Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning. The West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC), a 15-year partnership to create university-assisted community schools that connect the University of Pennsylvania and the West Philadelphia community, emerged and developed from seminars and research projects he directs with other colleagues at Penn.

Notes

1. Much of the following argument first appeared in Benson and Harkavy (2000).
2. For a stimulating discussion of Harper and the concept of captains of erudition, see Diner (1980).
3. For a discussion of Gilman and Low and their efforts to build and strengthen Hopkins and Columbia through engagement with the city and its problems, see Harkavy (1999).

4. We are grateful to Jack Foley, Executive Assistant to the President of Clark Atlanta University, for providing us with material on the University Park Campus School.
5. Much of the discussion on the El Paso Collaborative is based on a packet of material provided by Diane Natalicio, President of the University of Texas at El Paso. We are grateful for her assistance.

References

- Anderson, Charles W. 1993. *Prescribing the Life of the Mind*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Benson, Lee, and Ira Harkavy. 2000. "Integrating the American System of Higher, Secondary, and Primary Education to Develop Civic Responsibility," in Thomas Ehrlich, Ed. *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Chronicle of Higher Education* November 20, 1998, p. A20.
- Dewey, John. 1907/1976. "Education as a University Study," in Jo Ann Boydston, Ed. *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899–1924*, vol. 4: 1907–1909 (pp. 158–164). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.
- Diner, Steven J. 1980. *A City and Its Universities: Public Policy in Chicago, 1892–1919*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
- Harkavy, Ira. 1999. "School-Community-University Partnerships: Effectively Integrating Community Building and Education Reform," *Universities and Community Schools* 1, 2:7–24.
- Harper, William Rainey. 1905. *The Trend in Higher Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kennedy, Donald. 1997. *Academic Duty*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marsden, George. 1994. *The Soul of the American University. From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Sommerfeld, Meg. 1994. "Alliance for Learning: El Paso: Crossing the Border," *Education Week*, April 3. <http://www.edweek.org/ew/1994/29aaelp.h13>.
- Stokes, Donald. 1997. *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- University of Chicago. 1992. *The University and the City: A Centennial View of the University of Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Library.
- Wirth, Arthur W. 1964. *John Dewey as Educator: His Design for Work in Education (1894–1904)*. New York, NY: Wiley and Sons.